ACTIVE CASES
Analysis of May 2005 QA Results for Food Stamps

Sample Size: 85
  (drops excluded)

Totals for May 2005:

LOCATION	TOTAL SAMPLE ISSUANCE	# of ERROR CASES	ERROR DOLLAR TOTAL	PERCENT DOLLARS IN ERROR	FFY 2005 ERROR RATE
STATEWIDE	$16,614.00	13	$ 1,008.00	6.1%	5.5%
MILWAUKEE	8,407.00	4	349.00	4.2%	6.1%
BAL- STATE	8,207.00	9	659.00	8.0%	5.1%

ERROR CAUSES BY TYPE
9- Agency Preventable Errors
3- Client Errors
1- State Error- (CARES)
.

OVERVIEW OF THE ERRORS AND WHERE THEY OCCURRED:
Of the 9 Agency Preventable Errors, only one was in Milwaukee, one each in Dodge, Grant, Jefferson, Manitowoc, Marathon, Marinette, Racine and Richland Counties

TYPES OF A.P.E. ERRORS (9):

Regular Earned Income (4):
  1- failed to correctly calculate earnings
  1- failed to act on report that job ended-continued to budget the income
  1- made changes from report of new job, but didn't run SFED.
  1-made changes from report of reduced earnings, didn't supplement the next month.

Shelter Expense (1):
  1-Agency budgeted incorrect rent: Client provided inadequate verification. Receipt did not indicate period covered. Agency used $400 even though client reported rent as $635.

Utility Expense (1):
  1-Agency used heating standard although customer and landlord reported only an electric expense.

Food Unit (2):
  1- Agency failed to exclude someone who **Voluntarily Quit** a job; information was in the case record.
  1-Agency excluded an **Eligible Student.**

Unearned Income (1):
  1- **Caretaker Supp (CTS):** agency ran eligibility for and approved CTS but failed to re-run FS so the CTS would be budgeted for future months.

TYPE OF CLIENT ERRORS (3):

Earned Income (2) : FS Group failed to report a job at application in one case. In the other case client failed to report a new job on her SMRF.
Shelter (2): Client provided rent receipt in October 2003 for $228. The rent has never been $228, and in fact has never exceeded $50 since then. At reviews apparently the customer claims it hasn't been changed. This is a good example of why it is okay to question when the rent proof is old. NI the second case the receipts given weren't clear on what the total rent was, another example where it is correct to pend the case if it is unclear. There is some opinion "out there' that if they give you any type verification you have to accept it.

TYPE OF CARES ERRORS (1):
 CARES did not generate a SMRF because case was pending closed on Oct. 14th, when the SMRF would have been triggered. Case reopened later in the month CARES is supposed to send a SMRF out in this instance on 5th of next month.   FNS says that if this occurs (where none sent), it may cause an error because a SMRF is required for all 12 month cases with an interim reporting requirement. Therefore, QC must determine what the customer would have been required to report and the agency would have been required to budget, had a SMRF been issued at the time. Highly error prone.

WHEN WERE THE AGENCY PREVENTABLE ERRORS MADE?
Three of the errors were made at application three at review, and three made at reported change (on SMRF, new hire alert, or other call report)

WHEN WERE THE CLIENT ERRORS MADE?
One client error was failure to report information at time of application, one at review, and one on the SMRF.

EFFECT OF SMRF PROCESS:
As mentioned above the one CARES error occurred because the way CARES decides to send SMRFs out. At the time the SMRF would be triggered the case was pending closed. A SMRF is to be sent out by CARES on the 5th of the month after the case re-opened. A couple worker errors were made in budgeting from the SMRF, but not related to the SMRF process. The judgment errors were the same type made at application, reviews, or reported changes.

TRENDS OR RECOMMENDATIONS:
The numbers of Agency Preventable Errors are climbing. Several of the errors involved were SMRF related.   Two Self-employment errors occurred, which may suggest we should continue to consider changes or simplification of the budgeting policy.

BIGGEST "CONTRIBUTORS": The cases that caused the largest dollar errors for May 2005 (including client errors):

Grant County, $148 Agency Preventable: Caretaker Supp (CTS) income not budgeted. After CTS approved agency did not go back and run SFEX for FS, so the CTS income did not get included in the FS budget.

Milwaukee County, $$139 Client Error: <u>Earned Income. </u>The customer did not report new employment on the SMRF.

Marinette County, $125 Agency Preventable Error: <u>Ineligible Members. </u>The agency did not act to exclude an individual for a Voluntary Quit.   At a review in February the agency was aware of the VQT.

mbw 09/23/2005